

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 TAMMY BLAKEY and FLYING T RANCH,
12 INC.,

13 Defendants.

Case No. C23-1910-RSM

ORDER RE: MOTION TO WITHDRAW
AND MOTION TO STRIKE

14 This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Tammy Blakey's unopposed Motion to
15 Withdraw as Attorney, Dkt. #28, and the government's Motion to Strike, Dkt. #34. Defendant's
16 counsel, Ojala Law Inc., P.S. seeks to withdraw as counsel for Defendant Blakey under Local Rule
17 83.2(b) "because they have been discharged by Tammy Blakey personally in the above-captioned
18 matter on June 10, 2025." Dkt. #28 at 2. Ojala Law remains as counsel for Defendant Flying T
19 Ranch, Inc. *Id.* at 2. Defendant's counsel indicates that he conferred with the government's
20 counsel, "and they confirmed that they take no position on this motion and can represent it is
21 unopposed, and consented to it being noted for the same day." *Id.* at 3. Accordingly, the Court
22 will GRANT Defendant Blakey's Motion.

23 On June 13, 2025, three days after Defendant filed the above Motion to Withdraw,
24 Defendant Blakey filed a "Motion to Dismiss Complaint and Judicial Notice," Dkt. #29. On June
27, 2025, the government filed a Motion to Strike Defendant Blakey's Motion to Dismiss. Dkt.

#34. Because the withdrawal motion was still pending at the time she filed, the government contends that Defendant Blakey was not authorized to file any motions because she is represented by an attorney. Dkt. #34; *see* LCR 83.2(b)(5) (providing that a party represented by an attorney cannot appear on her own behalf without requesting from and being granted by the Court to terminate counsel and proceed *pro se*). The government “alternatively requests that the Court treat the Motion to Dismiss as filed on the same day the Court grants Ms. Blakey’s attorney’s withdrawal motion . . . and re-note the Motion to Dismiss accordingly for 28 days from that date.” *Id.* at 2 (citing LCR 7(d)(4)). In the interest of a “just, speedy, and inexpensive determination[.]” the Court will GRANT this alternative request. Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

Accordingly, having reviewed the instant Motions and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS:

(1) Defendant Blakey’s Motion to Withdraw, Dkt. #28, is GRANTED. Defendant Blakey shall proceed *pro se*. Defendant Flying T Ranch, Inc., remains represented by counsel Ojala Law Inc., P.S.

(2) Plaintiff United States’ Motion to Strike, Dkt. #34, is GRANTED IN PART. The Court will consider *pro se* Defendant Blakey’s Motion to Dismiss as if filed on the same day as her former counsel’s Motion to Withdraw, June 10, 2025, and **RE-NOTES Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss, Dkt. #29, for July 8, 2025.**

DATED this 1st day of July, 2025.



RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE